



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/576,927	05/23/2000	Richard Reisman	1311.1200	3435

5514 7590 05/31/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/576,927

Applicant(s)

REISMAN, RICHARD

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22 and 24-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15,17-22 and 24-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 May 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 04/04/2005. Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, 20-22, 27-32, 36, 39, 51, 54 and 57 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-22 and 24-62 remain for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-5, 6-8, 10-15, 17-22, 24-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al. (US 6,092,100), hereinafter referred as Berstis, in view of Bates et al. (US 6,873,982), hereinafter referred as Bates.**

4. As to claim 1, Berstis teaches a method for finding, in response to entry by a user of a resource identity signifier, a single intended target resource intended by the user to uniquely correspond to the resource identity signifier, among a plurality of resources, the method comprising:

receiving a user input (*receiving a character string from a user, step 59 of Fig. 4*);

recognizing the user input as a resource identity signifier (*a test is done at steps 52 and 55 of Fig. 4 to determine whether the received string as a resource identify signifier such as a target server name or a target server IP address*);

accessing a database to determine (*accessing databases including an index of resources available on the network and information regarding user feedback gathered in previous executions*), based on the database information including the multi-user feedback (*based on the multi-user feedback information from the databases of one or more external dedicated servers 46-46n which maybe located at or associated with an Internet Service Provider "ISP" 48*), which, if any, of the indexed resources is likely to be the intended target resource based on the recognized resource identify signifier (*the received character string is indexed into a lexicon of server IP names that have been used by the Web client over a given "history" period to be matched against any entry in the lexicon with respect to a given confidence level, i.e., a predetermined threshold, to determine the "best" match, i.e., the intended target resource*) (Berstis, Figs. 4-5 and corresponding text, C2: L27-42, C5: L24-35 and L50-67 and C6: L1-16).

However, Berstis does not explicitly teach learning from the database information via the learning system wherein the learning provides distinct weight to the multi-user feedback.

In a related art, Bates teaches a system and method for ordering of database search results based on user feedback, wherein the search engine 62 periodically updates the user feedback information stored in search database 63 through a separate thread 94 in response to information stored in staging table 68 which records

information regarding the interaction of a user with a particular record from the result set and staging table 69 which tracks search requests received from users of the search engine 62 (Bates, C8: L43-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Berstis and Bates to learn from the database information via the learning system wherein the learning provides distinct weight to the multi-user feedback since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system to maintain the current, up-to-date confidence level of associated indexed resources (*e.g., URLs, key terms, web sites, web pages, etc.*) by relatively updating the user feedback information (*i.e., weight*) in response to user interactions with results and user initiation of search requests to improve the speed and quality of search results to return to the user (Bates, C8: L43-56 and C17: L21-29).

5. As to claim 3, Berstis-Bates teaches the method of claim 1, wherein a resource is determined, at the accessing step, as likely to be the intended target resource if the database information indicates that a confidence level associated with that resource is of at least a predetermined level (*i.e., at least a predetermined threshold*) (Berstis, C6: L12-16).

6. As to claim 4, Berstis-Bates teaches the method of claim 3, wherein if none of the indexed resources has an associated confidence level of at least the predetermined level, the method further comprises the step of:

presenting the user with a list of one or more links to possible resources, the list being ordered according to confidence level, with a resource having a highest confidence level being ranked highest (Berstis, C6: L17-39).

7. As to claim 5, Berstis-Bates teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

causing a computer of the user so as to enable that computer to connect to a URL of an indexed resource having a highest confidence level (*i.e., if the user-entered character string best "matches" a URL entry in the lexicon by the predetermined threshold, the browser is automatically launched to the "best matched" URL*) (Berstis, C6: L12-16); and

presenting the user with a list of one or more links to possible resources, the list being ordered according to confidence level, with a resource having a highest confidence level being ranked highest (Berstis, C6: L17-39).

8. Claims 6-7, 13-14, 20-21 and 27-28 are combination method, apparatus, system and computer-readable storage medium claims of method claims 1 and 3-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claims 8, 10-12, 15 and 17-19, 22 and 24-26 are corresponding apparatus, system and computer-readable storage medium claims of method claims 1 and 3-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 29-31 are corresponding system, method and apparatus claims of method claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 32-42 are corresponding system, method and apparatus claims of method claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

12. As to claims 43-44, Berstis-Bates teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising the steps of causing a computer of the user to connect to the determined intended resource and display the determined intended target resource, if any (*i.e., if the user-entered character string best "matches" a URL entry in the lexicon by the predetermined threshold, the browser is automatically launched to the "best matched" URL*) (Berstis, C6: L12-16).

13. Claims 45-50 are corresponding apparatus, system and computer-readable storage medium claims of method claims 43-44; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

14. Claims 51-59 are corresponding method, apparatus and computer-readable storage medium claims of method claim 1; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

15. Claims 60-62 are corresponding method, apparatus and computer-readable storage medium claims of method claim 1 (*wherein the resource identity signifier does not include a URL or portion thereof, i.e., a key/search term*); therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

16. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 04/04/2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER